

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIG. 1, FIG. 2A, FIG. 3 and FIG. 4. The attached sheets replace the original sheets including FIGS. 1, 2A, 3, and 4. FIGS. 1, 2A, 3, and 4 have been redrawn to better define all of the elements and the referencing lines and arrows.

In FIG. 1, the numeral "12" has been added adjacent the arrow in smokestack 20 that has no number associated with it. Sidewall 18 has been drawn more clearly to better illustrate the embodiment of the invention shown in FIG. 1. In FIG. 2A, the ends of arrows associated with the numerals 26 and 28 have been redrawn and extended to more accurately point to controlled shutters 26 and 28, respectively.

Attachments: Four replacements sheets.

REMARKS

The aforementioned errors were found in a final review of the application prior to payment of the issue fee. These are minor typographical mistakes which occurred through inadvertence. No new matter is added to the case by this amendment. It is therefore requested that the amendment be entered before the patent is printed.

With regard to the Examiner's Reason's For Allowance as stated in the Notice of Allowance dated July 3, 2006, the Applicant asserts that the claims, as originally written (including any amendments made during prosecution), speak for themselves and should be understood to mean and otherwise claim what is explicitly stated in each claim, as read in light of the specification. For example, in the Examiner's Reason's for Allowance, the Examiner combines the discussion of both claims 1 and 10 together as if he is "hybridizing" the claims, and refers to "a calibration shutter" as if it was a limitation in both claims 1 and 10. However, claim 1 and claim 10 are separate and distinct independent claims. Though claim 1 explicitly mentions a calibration shutter, claim 10 makes no mention of a calibration shutter. Claim 10, as amended, only mentions "the light detection system to selectively enable light from the light emission system access to the light detection system" Therefore, as demonstrated by this example, all of the claims, including independent claims 1 and 10, should be interpreted and construed, if necessary, based on the specific language of each claim, as read in light of the other claims, the specification, the prosecution history, and any other appropriate evidence.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By: 

Mark S. Graham
Registration No. 32,355

MSG:MER:lal

Date: Sept. 29, 2006
P.O. Box 1871
Knoxville, Tennessee 37901
(865) 546-4305